

Remarks

Applicant has considered the Final Office Action mailed on December 13, 2006. Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-34 are pending in the present patent application. Of the pending claims, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-17 and 19-34. In response to the Final Office Action, Applicant amended claims 1, 3-9, 12-13, 17, 19-25, 28-29 and 33-34 to better define the patentable features of the claimed invention. No new matter has been added. The amendments to claims 1, 3-9, 12-13, 17, 19-25, 28-29 and 33-34 are not narrowing amendments and thus Applicant reserves all rights afforded under the Doctrine of Equivalents for these claims. These amendments, which are in compliance with 37 CFR §1.116, materially clarifies the issues raised by the Examiner and do not recite differently claimed subject matter which would require a further search by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner enter the amendments and reconsider the present patent application in light of the above-noted changes and the following comments.

In the Final Office Action the Examiner has maintained the rejection of 1, 3-17 and 19-34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambrecht (US Patent No. 5,809,261) in view of Lueck et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0038947). As mentioned above, Applicant amended claims 1, 3-9, 12-13, 17, 19-25, 28-29 and 33-34 to better define the patentable features of the claimed invention. Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-17 and 19-

34 are patentable over the combination of Lambrecht in view of Lueck et al. (Lueck).

Independent claims 1, 17 and 33 of the present invention now recite, *inter alia*, the limitation that the multiple TCL modules communicate in parallel with external devices remote from the computer system in near real-time with low latency. The combination of Lambrecht in view of Lueck does not disclose or suggest having multiple TCL modules that can communicate in parallel with remote external devices in near real-time with low latency. The combination of Lambrecht in view of Lueck describes a method for transferring real-time data within a computer system and not to transferring data to remote devices with low latency that are external to the computer system. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combination of Lambrecht in view of Lueck does not disclose or suggest having multiple TCL modules that can communicate in parallel with remote external devices in near real-time with low latency.

Because the combination of Lambrecht in view of Lueck does not disclose or suggest having multiple TCL modules that can communicate in parallel with remote external devices in near real-time with low latency, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 17 and 33 are patentably distinguishable over the combination. Claims 3-16; 19-32; and 34 depend directly or indirectly from now presumably allowable claims 1, 17 and 33, respectively, and thus are in allowable condition by dependency. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3-17 and 19-34 under the combination of Lambrecht in view of Lueck.

